

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/586,131		06/02/2000	Marc Delcourt	1184-00	6329
22469	7590	01/08/2003			
		RISON SEGAL &	EXAMINER		
1600 MARKET STREET SUITE 3600				FRIEND, TOMAS H F	
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1639	`	
				DATE MAILED: 01/08/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/586,131	DELCOURT, MARC					
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Tomas Friend	1639					
The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 25 November 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the main	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or					
timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 25 November 2002. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in							
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	, ·	en e					
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.	e de la companya della companya della companya de la companya della companya dell	 Face of the control of Page of Copyright Co					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:							
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		en e					
Claim(s) allowed: <i>None</i> .		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Claim(s) objected to: None.	,						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 20-22.							
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-14/49) Paper No(s)							
10. Other:							
ANDREW WARDS							
	RVISORY PATENT EXAMINE:	Tomas Friend, Ph.D. 26 December 2002					

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No. 09/586,131

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment would lead to the reinstatement of a windrawn rejection. The proposed amendment removes the limitation regarding the method being useful to isolate a nucleic acid fragment and diagnose a genetic disease, which would lead to the reinstatement of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 previously withdrawn.

The claimed invention is a method of isolating an intact clone of one target nucleic acid fragment having a known characteristic.

Applicant argues that the method can be used to isolate a nucleic acid sequence with known utility. Applicant's argument has been fully considered but it is not persuasive. Identifying a nucleic acid fragment that is already known or indentifying a sequence with an unspecified enzymatic activity is not a specific and substantial utility. Applicants do not exemplify or assert a specific and substantial utility in the application as filed.

Applicant argues that the specific and substantial utility is to isolate a target nucleic acid sequence from a mixture of DNA fragments of similar size. Applicant's argument has been fully considered but it is not persuasive. The specific and substantial utility to isolate a target nucleic acid sequence from a mixture of DNA fragments of similar size not asserted in the application as filed. Further, the claimed method isolates fragments based upon a known characteristic with no limitation regarding similar sizes of fragments.